arXiv:0706.1761v2 [quant-ph] 26 Jun 2007

From Extraspecial Two-Groups To GHZ States

Yong Zhang [a], Eric C. Rowell [b], Yong-Shi Wu [a], [1]
Zhenghan Wang [cd], and Mo-Lin Ge [e] [2]

[a] Department of Physics, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT 84112
[b] Department of Mathematics, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 77843
[c] Microsoft Research, Station Q, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA 93106
[d] Department of Mathematics, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN 47405,
[e] Chern Institute of Mathematics, Nankai University, Tianjin 300071, P. R. China

Abstract

In this paper we explore natural connections among extraspecial 2-groups, almost-complex structures, unitary representations of the braid group and the Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger (GHZ) states. We first present *new* representations of extraspecial 2-groups in terms of almost-complex structures and use them to derive *new* unitary braid representations as extensions of representations of the extraspecial 2-groups by the symmetric group. A few subtleties related to the correspondence between the unitary braid representations and the GHZ states (particularly those for an *odd* number of qubits) are clarified. We also discuss Yang–Baxterization of the new braid group representations and unitary evolution of the GHZ states. Our study suggests that the unitary braiding quantum gates may play an important role, through extraspecial 2-groups, in quantum error correction and topological quantum computing.

PACS numbers: 02.10.Kn, 03.65.Ud, 03.67.Lx
MSC 2000 numbers: 81P68 (Primary) 20F36, 20C35, 81R05 (Secondary)
Key Words: Yang–Baxter, Extraspecial 2-groups, GHZ State

---

[1] yong@physics.utah.edu; rowell@math.tamu.edu; wu@physics.utah.edu
[2] zhenghwa@microsoft.com; geml@nankai.edu.cn

1 Introduction

Recently, in a series of papers [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8] it has been revealed that there are natural and profound connections between quantum information theory [9] and the Yang–Baxter equation (YBE) [10, 11]. Unitary solutions of the braided YBE (i.e., the braid group relation) [1, 2] as well as unitary solutions of the quantum Yang–Baxter equation (QYBE) [3, 4] can often be identified with universal quantum gates [12]. Yang–Baxterization [13, 14] is exploited [3, 4] to derive the Hamiltonian for the unitary evolution of a unitary braid gate and determine the unitary evolution of the Bell states on the Bloch sphere with the oscillating entanglement degree. Werner states [15] are viewed as a rational solution of the QYBE as well as isotropic states [16] with specific parameters form a braid representation, see [6].

Furthermore, the Bell matrix generating all the Bell states from the product basis has been recognized to be a unitary solution to the braided YBE, and relevant mathematical and physical topics have been discussed [3, 4, 5, 7]. Higher dimensional unitary braid representations, called the generalized Bell matrices by Zhang and Ge [8], are used to generate all the Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger (GHZ) states from the product basis. The GHZ states [17, 18, 19] are maximally entangled multipartite states (a natural generalization of the Bell states) and play important roles in quantum information. More importantly, the generalized Bell matrix is found in [8] to have the form of an almost-complex structure, which is fundamental for complex and Kähler geometry as well as symplectic geometry. In addition, Yang–Baxterization [13, 14] of the generalized Bell matrix has been used [8] to derive the Hamiltonian for the unitary evolution of the GHZ states.

On the other hand, in a recent paper by Franko, Rowell and Wang [5], the images of the unitary braid group representations generated by the original 4×4 Bell matrix have been identified as extensions of extraspecial 2-groups. The decompositions of these reducible braid group representations into their irreducible constituents have also been determined, which are shown to be closely related to the well-known Jones representations [20, 21]. Extraspecial 2-groups are now known to play an important role in theory of quantum information, and particularly in the theory of quantum error correction. They provide a bridge between quantum error correcting codes and binary orthogonal geometry [22]. They also form a subgroup of the Pauli group [23], which plays a crucial role in the theory of stablized code [24].

These motivate us to explore, in the spirit of [5], the profound relationship between an extension of representations of extraspecial 2-groups (in terms of the almost-complex structure) by the symmetric group and the higher dimensional Bell matrices (also related to the almost-complex structures [8]). Indeed, as reported below in this paper, extraspecial 2-groups are found to be the central link between almost-complex structures and unitary braid representations. New higher dimensional unitary braid group representations can be constructed by considering an extension of the representations of extraspecial 2-groups (which are constructed in terms of almost-complex structures) by the symmetric group. These unitary braid representations are more general than those in recent papers [8, 25]. Also, several kinds of unitary braid representations are recognized to generate the GHZ states for an arbitrary number (particularly an odd number) of qubits from the standard product basis. In this way, a new connection is established between extraspecial 2-groups and the GHZ states. This suggests the use of the unitary braiding quantum gates and the GHZ states, through extraspecial 2-groups, in quantum error correction codes as well as in topological quantum computing.

Goldschmidt and Jones [26] use extraspecial p-groups (Heisenberg groups) to construct braid group (specialized Burau-Squier) representations factoring over finite symplectic groups. Although they work exclusively over fields of odd characteristic and hence only extraspecial p-groups with $p \neq 2$ appear, our work may be thought of as a characteristic 2 complement to [26] in some respects, particularly as link invariants are concerned.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we record our notational conventions and motivation. Section 3 and 4 embody all key points presented: in Section 3 we focus on extrapspecial 2-groups, almost-complex structures and unitary braid representations; whereas in Section 4 we explain how to obtain GHZ states using unitary basis transformation matrices or unitary braid representations, and how to determine their unitary evolution under Hamiltonians obtained via Yang–Baxterization [13, 14]. Section 5 is devoted to concluding remarks, while Appendices A, B and C present calculation details for interested readers.

2 Notation, definitions and motivation

We use Id or $\mathbb{1}$ to denote the identity operator and $\mathbb{1}_m$ the $m \times m$ identity matrix. The superscripts $*$ and $\dagger$, respectively, denote the complex conjugation and Hermitian operation of a matrix (or a complex number). The symbol δ_{ij} is the Kronecker function of two variables i, j, which is 1 if $i = j$ and 0 otherwise. The generalized step function $\epsilon(k)$ is defined by

$$\epsilon(k)\epsilon(k) = 1, \quad \epsilon(k)\epsilon(\bar{k}) = -1, \tag{2.1}$$

which has solutions $\epsilon(k) = \pm 1$, $\epsilon(\bar{k}) = \mp 1$, and either $\bar{k} = -k$ or $\bar{k} = 2n - k + 1$ depending on the convention used for the range of k or $\bar{k}$. The tensor product $A \otimes B$ of the matrices $A = (A_{ij})$ and $B = (B_{kl})$ is defined by the convention $(A \otimes B)_{ik,jl} = A_{ij}B_{kl}$.

The symbol $A^{J_1 J_2}$ denotes a matrix having the following matrix entries,

$$(A^{J_1 J_2})_{\mu a, \nu b}, \ \mu, \nu = J_1, J_1 - 1, \cdots, -J_1, \ a, b = J_2, J_2 - 1, \cdots, -J_2, \tag{2.2}$$

where J_1, J_2 are integers or half-integers. The matrix $A^{J_1 J_2}$ has the following operator presentation, also denoted as $A^{J_1 J_2}$, in terms of Dirac kets and bras:

$$A^{J_1 J_2} = \sum_{\mu=-J_1}^{J_1} \sum_{\nu=-J_1}^{J_1} \sum_{a=-J_2}^{J_2} \sum_{b=-J_2}^{J_2} (A^{J_1 J_2})_{\mu a, \nu b} |\mu a\rangle \langle \nu b|, \tag{2.3}$$

where the kets $|\{\mu\rangle\}$ or $\{|a\rangle\}$ form an orthonormal basis, respectively, in $2J_1 + 1$ and $2J_2 + 1$ dimensional Hilbert space:

$$\sum_{\mu=-J_1}^{J_1} |\mu\rangle\langle\mu| = 1\!\!1_{(2J_1+1)}, \qquad \sum_{a=-J_2}^{J_2} |a\rangle\langle a| = 1\!\!1_{(2J_2+1)}, \tag{2.4}$$

where $\langle\mu|\nu\rangle = \delta_{\mu\nu}$ and $\langle a|b\rangle = \delta_{ab}$.

The Pauli matrices $\sigma_x, \sigma_y, \sigma_z$ have the conventional forms

$$\sigma_x = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \sqrt{-1}\sigma_y = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \sigma_z = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{2.5}$$

Artin's braid group $\mathcal{B}_n$ on n strands has the well-known presentation in terms of generators $b_1, \ldots, b_{n-1}$ satisfying the commutation relation

$$b_i b_j = b_j b_i, \qquad |i - j| \geq 2 \tag{2.6}$$

and the braid relations

$$b_i b_{i+1} b_i = b_{i+1} b_i b_{i+1}, \qquad 1 \leq i \leq n - 2. \tag{2.7}$$

Usually the last relation leads to the braided version of the YBE, i.e.,

$$(\check{R} \otimes 1\!\!1_d)(1\!\!1_d \otimes \check{R})(\check{R} \otimes 1\!\!1_d) = (1\!\!1_d \otimes \check{R})(\check{R} \otimes 1\!\!1_d)(1\!\!1_d \otimes \check{R}), \tag{2.8}$$

with an invertible $d^2 \otimes d^2$ matrix $\check{R}$: $V \otimes V \to V \otimes V$ ($V \equiv \mathbb{C}^d$ being a d-dimensional complex vector space). The relation (2.8) gives rise to a sequence of representations $(\pi_n, (\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes n})$ of $\mathcal{B}_n$:

$$\pi_n(b_i) = 1\!\!1_d^{\otimes i-1} \otimes \check{R} \otimes 1\!\!1_d^{\otimes n-i-1} \tag{2.9}$$

since clearly $\pi_n(b_i)$ and $\pi_n(b_j)$ commute for $|i - j| \geq 2$. Below we will use this type of the braid group representations to construct the GHZ states for an even number of qubits.

To construct the GHZ for an *odd* number of qubits, we will explore solutions to a *generalized version* of the YBE:

$$(\check{R} \otimes 1\!\!1_l)(1\!\!1_l \otimes \check{R})(\check{R} \otimes 1\!\!1_l) = (1\!\!1_l \otimes \check{R})(\check{R} \otimes 1\!\!1_l)(1\!\!1_l \otimes \check{R}), \tag{2.10}$$

where $l = p^k$ ($2 \leq p \in \mathbb{N}$) and $\check{R}$ is an invertible $d' \otimes d'$ matrix with $d' = p^N$. Both sides act on the tensor product $(\mathbb{C}^p)^{\otimes(k+N)}$. When $k = 1, N = 2$, the generalized YBE (2.10) is the same as the ordinary YBE (2.8). If $k > N/2$, then the relation

(2.10) gives rise again to a sequence of representations $(\pi_n, (\mathbb{C}^p)^{\otimes(N+k(n-2))})$ of the braid group $\mathcal{B}_n$:

$$\pi_n(b_i) = \mathbb{1}_l^{\otimes i-1} \otimes \check{R} \otimes \mathbb{1}_l^{\otimes n-i-1} \tag{2.11}$$

since again $\pi_n(b_i)$ and $\pi_n(b_j)$ commute for $|i-j| \geq 2$. In the following we are going to consider only the case with $p=2$, corresponding to qubits.

$\mathcal{B}_n$ has a finite-index normal subgroup $\mathcal{P}_n$ generated by the conjugacy class of $(b_1)^2$. $\mathcal{P}_n$ is called the *pure braid group* and can be understood as the kernel of the surjective homomorphism $\mathcal{B}_n \to \mathcal{S}_n$ given by $b_i \to (i, i+1)$. In other words we have an isomorphism $\mathcal{S}_n \cong \mathcal{B}_n/\mathcal{P}_n$. The term "pure braids" applied to elements of $\mathcal{P}_n$ is due to the fact that in the geometric formulation of $\mathcal{B}_n$ as braiding operators on n strands, the elements of $\mathcal{P}_n$ are exactly those that do not permute the strands.

2.1 Motivation

The images of the braid group $\mathcal{B}_n$ and pure braid group $\mathcal{P}_n$ under the representation π_n associated to $\check{R}$ are denoted by $G_n := \pi_n(\mathcal{B}_n)$ and $H_n := \pi_n(\mathcal{P}_n)$ respectively. The quotient group G_n/H_n is a homomorphic image of $\mathcal{S}_n$, as π_n induces a surjective homomorphism $\pi_n' : (\mathcal{S}_n \cong)\mathcal{B}_n/\mathcal{P}_n \to G_n/H_n$. Given an $\check{R}$, there are several mathematical problems that are often studied: 1) What are the images G_n, H_n as abstract groups? 2) How does π_n decompose into irreducible representations of G_n (and H_n)? 3) Does the sequence $\cdots \subset G_n \subset G_{n+1} \subset \cdots$ support a trace-induced link invariant? In addition, as the braided YBE has physical origins, one may ask for physical interpretations as mentioned in the introduction.

For the specific family of (unitary) braid group representations obtained by taking $\check{R}$ to be the 4×4 Bell matrix that generates the Bell basis from the product basis, the mathematical problems were solved in [5]. There it was shown that the induced homomorphism π_n' is in fact an isomorphism so that the image G_n is an extension of H_n by $\mathcal{S}_n$. In other words, there exists an exact sequence,

$$\mathbb{1} \to H_n \to G_n \to \mathcal{S}_n \to \mathbb{1}, \tag{2.12}$$

for all $n \geq 2$. Moreover, the groups H_n were determined to be (nearly) extraspecial 2-groups, from which the irreducible decompositions of π_n were obtained. Finally, the representations π_n were shown to be related to the well-known Jones representations [20, 21] associated to specializations of the Jones polynomial. On the other hand, in [8], it was observed that the results in [5] turned upon understanding a certain (real) skew-symmetric matrix M satisfying $M^2 = -\mathbb{1}_4$ (i.e. an *almost-complex structure*, see below) and its promotions to higher dimensions. In this paper, we extend the results of [5] and [8] to a very general setting.

We ask the question: *When does an anti-Hermitian almost-complex structure M gives rise to representations of $\mathcal{B}_n$ in the same fashion as in [5]?*. It is known that an almost-complex structure M is specified by a linear map from a $2k$-dimensional real vector space ($k \in \mathbb{N}$) to itself satisfying $M^2 = -\mathbb{1}$. As suggested in [8], we seek $2k \times 2k$ anti-Hermitian almost-complex structures M, such that setting $\check{R} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\mathbb{1} + M)$ induces a solution to the (generalized) YBE (2.8) or (2.10). Then a (unitary) braid group representation of $\mathcal{B}_n$ for all $n \geq 2$ might be given by setting $b_i \to \check{R}_i$ with the operator $\check{R}_i = \mathbb{1}_l^{\otimes i-1} \otimes \check{R} \otimes \mathbb{1}_l^{\otimes n-i-1}$ for $1 \leq i \leq n-1$. Naturally M cannot be chosen arbitrarily, and the possible values of l depends on the particular choice of M.

In this way we extend the results of [5] to higher dimensional $\check{R}$-matrices, which are subsequently shown to be associated with the GHZ states, some of which are known [8, 25] and some are new (see below). Later we will see that the $\check{R}$-matrices associated with the GHZ states for an even number of qubits satisfy the ordinary YBE (2.8), while those for an odd number of qubits the generalized YBE (2.10).

In differential geometry almost-complex structures appear prominently as operators on the tangent space at each point on a smooth manifold; we leave the study of geometric aspects underlying our setup of almost-complex structures M to the future.

3 Extraspecial 2-groups, almost-complex structures and unitary braid representations

In [5], extraspecial 2-groups are seen to play a key role in studying the images of the braid group $\mathcal{B}_n$ under the representation associated with the 4×4 Bell matrix. Inspired by this work, we present an approach to the GHZ states (higher dimensional generalizations of the Bell states) starting from extraspecial 2-groups and their anti-Hermitian representations in terms of almost-complex structures.

3.1 Extraspecial 2-groups and related groups

The next two subsections contain a brief sketch of extraspecial 2-groups including their important properties and irreducible representations. The group $\mathbf{E}_m$ is the abstract group generated by $e_1, \ldots, e_m$ with relations:

$$e_i^2 = -\mathbb{1}, \; e_i e_j = e_j e_i, \; |i-j| \geq 2, \quad e_{i+1} e_i = -e_i e_{i+1}, \; 1 \leq i, j \leq m-1, \quad (3.1)$$

Here $-\mathbb{1}$ is an order 2 central element, and we denote $-\mathbb{1}a$ by $-a$. Helpful references are Exercise 3.9 in the text by Fulton and Harris [27] and the paper by Griess [28]. Technically, a group G of order 2^{m+1} is an **extraspecial 2-group** if the center $Z(G)$ and the commutator subgroup G' coincide and are isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}_2$ as well as $G/Z(G) \cong (\mathbb{Z}_2)^m$; see [28]. The commutator subgroup of $\mathbf{E}_m$ is $\{\pm\mathbb{1}\}$ due to its (anti-)commutation relations, and hence it is immediate that $\mathbf{E}_{2k}$ is an extraspecial 2-group. When m is odd, $\mathbf{E}_m$ does not fit the technical definition of extraspecial 2-group as the center will have order 4. However, since $\mathbf{E}_{m-1} \subset \mathbf{E}_m \subset \mathbf{E}_{m+1}$ we obtain an extraspecial 2-group from $\mathbf{E}_m$ by adding or removing a generator, so we will call $\mathbf{E}_m$ with m odd a *nearly* extraspecial 2-group.

Any element in $\mathbf{E}_m$ can be expressed in a unique normal form: $\pm e_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots e_m^{\alpha_m}$ where $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{Z}_2$, and $\mathbf{E}_m/\{\pm \mathbb{1}\} \cong (\mathbb{Z}_2)^m$. Denote by $Z(\mathbf{E}_m)$ the center of $\mathbf{E}_m$ given by

$$Z(\mathbf{E}_m) = \left\{ \begin{array}{cc} \{\pm \mathbb{1}\} & m \text{ even} \\ \{\pm \mathbb{1}, \pm e_1 e_3 \cdots e_m\} & m \text{ odd} \end{array} \right. \tag{3.2}$$

which suggests that any nontrivial normal subgroup of $\mathbf{E}_m$ intersects $Z(\mathbf{E}_m)$ nontrivially and any $x \in \mathbf{E}_m \setminus Z(\mathbf{E}_m)$ is conjugate to $-x$. In particular, for $m = 2k - 1$ odd, the center $Z(\mathbf{E}_{2k-1})$ is of a simplified form,

$$Z(\mathbf{E}_{2k-1}) \cong \left\{ \begin{array}{cc} \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2 & k \text{ even} \\ \mathbb{Z}_4 & k \text{ odd} \end{array} \right. \tag{3.3}$$

3.2 Irreducible representations of $\mathbf{E}_m$

Irreducible representations of $\mathbf{E}_m$ are considered in two cases corresponding to the parity of m. For $m = 2k$, there are 2^{2k} inequivalent 1-dimensional representations (ρ_j, V_j), $j = 2, \cdots, 2^{2k} + 1$ of the form

$$\rho_j(\pm \mathbb{1}) = 1, \quad \rho_j(\pm e_i) = \pm 1, \; i = 1, \cdots 2k, \tag{3.4}$$

(recalling that $-\mathbb{1}$ is a central element of $\mathbf{E}_m$), and one irreducible 2^k-dimension representation denoted by (ρ_1, V_1) a realization of which is defined on generators $e_1, \cdots, e_{2k}$ by:

$$\begin{array}{ll} \rho_1(e_1) = \sqrt{-1}(\sigma_z \otimes \mathbb{1}_2^{\otimes k-1}), & \rho_1(e_{2i}) = \mathbb{1}_2^{\otimes i-1} \otimes \sqrt{-1}\sigma_y \otimes \mathbb{1}_2^{\otimes k-i}, \\ \rho_1(e_{2i+1}) = \sqrt{-1}(\mathbb{1}_2^{\otimes i-1} \otimes \sigma_z^{\otimes 2} \otimes \mathbb{1}_2^{\otimes k-i-1}), & \text{for } 1 \leq i \end{array} \tag{3.5}$$

where $\rho_1(\pm \mathbb{1}) = \pm 1$.

For $m = 2k - 1$, $\mathbf{E}_m$ has 2^{2k-1} inequivalent 1-dimensional representations denoted by (λ_j, W_j), $j = 3, \cdots, 2^{2k-1} + 2$ of the form

$$\lambda_j(\pm \mathbb{1}) = 1, \quad \lambda_j(\pm e_i) = \pm 1, \; i = 1, \cdots 2k - 1. \tag{3.6}$$

$\mathbf{E}_{2k-1}$ has two inequivalent irreducible 2^{k-1}-dimension representations (λ_1, W_1) and (λ_2, W_2). The former is realized on the generators by

$$\begin{array}{ll} \lambda_1(e_1) = \sqrt{-1}\sigma_z \otimes \mathbb{1}_2^{\otimes k-2}, & \lambda_1(e_{2i}) = \mathbb{1}_2^{\otimes i-1} \otimes \sqrt{-1}\sigma_y \otimes \mathbb{1}_2^{\otimes k-i-1}, \\ \lambda_1(e_{2i+1}) = \sqrt{-1}\mathbb{1}_2^{\otimes i-1} \otimes \sigma_z^{\otimes 2} \otimes \mathbb{1}_2^{\otimes k-i-2}, & \lambda_1(e_{2k-1}) = \sqrt{-1}\mathbb{1}_2^{\otimes k-2} \otimes \sigma_z, \end{array} \tag{3.7}$$

where $1 \leq i \leq k - 2$. Observe that $\lambda_1(\pm \mathbb{1}) = \pm 1$. On the generators λ_2 is identical to λ_1 except that the image of e_{2k-1} differs in sign.

The following key lemma shows that from some representations of $\mathbf{E}_{n-1}$ we may construct a non-trivial representation of $\mathcal{B}_n$ (already observed in [8]):

Lemma 3.8. *Let* $\{T_1, \ldots, T_{n-1}\}$ *be the images of the generators* $\{e_1, \ldots, e_{n-1}\}$ *of* $\mathbf{E}_{n-1}$ *under a representation* ϕ_{n-1} *of* $\mathbf{E}_{n-1}$ *such that:*

(E1) $T_i^2 = -Id$,

(E2) $T_iT_j = T_jT_i$ *if* $|i-j| > 1$,

(E3) $T_iT_{i+1} = -T_{i+1}T_i$ *for all* $1 \leq i \leq (n-2)$.

Then

- *(a) The representation* ϕ_{n-1} *contains no 1-dimensional subrepresentations and*
- *(b) the set of matrices* $\{\check{R}_1, \ldots, \check{R}_{n-1}\}$ *defined by* $\check{R}_i = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(Id + T_i)$ *gives a representation of* $\mathcal{B}_n$ *by* $b_i \to \check{R}_i$.
- *(c) If in addition the* T_i *are anti-Hermitian (i.e.* $T_i = -T_i^\dagger$*), the* $\mathcal{B}_n$ *representation is unitary.*
- *(d) Moreover, if* n *is odd,* ϕ_{n-1} *is a direct sum of* $\frac{\dim(\phi_{n-1})}{2^{(n-1)/2}}$ *copies of* ρ_1.

Proof. If the central element $-\mathbb{1} \in \mathbf{E}_{n-1}$ has image $-Id$ then this holds for any subrepresentation of ϕ_{n-1} as well. By the explicit construction of 1-dimensional representations of $\mathbf{E}_{n-1}$ above, ϕ_{n-1} has no 1-dimensional representations since $-\mathbb{1}$ acts by 1 for these representations. This proves (a). Claim (d) follows immediately from (a), since for $n-1$ even there is only one irreducible representation of dimension more that 1, and its dimension is $2^{(n-1)/2}$.

The matrices $\check{R}_i$ obviously satisfy relation (2.6) since the T_i satisfy $(E2)$. Moreover, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\sqrt{2}\check{R}_i\check{R}_{i+1}\check{R}_i &= T_iT_{i+1}T_i + 2T_i + T_{i+1} + T_iT_{i+1} + T_{i+1}T_i + T_i^2 + Id \\ &= 2T_{i+1} + 2T_i + T_iT_{i+1} + T_{i+1}T_i\end{aligned}$$

which is symmetric under $i \leftrightarrow i+1$ so that the $\check{R}_i$ satisfy the braid relation (2.7) : $\check{R}_i\check{R}_{i+1}\check{R}_i = \check{R}_{i+1}\check{R}_i\check{R}_{i+1}$. This proves (b).

Observing that $\check{R}_i^{-1} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\mathbb{1} - T_i)$ it is clear that if the T_i are anti-Hermitian then the $\check{R}_i$ are unitary, giving (c). □

Remark 3.9. It is interesting to note that if the T_i satisfy $(E1)$ and $(E2)$ then the matrices $\check{R}_i = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\mathbb{1} + T_i)$ satisfy (2.6) automatically, and satisfy (2.7) precisely when

$$(E3') \quad T_i + T_iT_{i+1}T_i - T_{i+1} - T_{i+1}T_iT_{i+1} = 0.$$

While $(E3)$ is sufficient to imply $(E3')$, one wonders if there are other interesting group relations or almost-complex structures that also satisfy $(E3')$.

3.3 Almost-complex structures and representations of $\mathbf{E}_m$

Now we introduce almost-complex structures with an eye towards constructing representations of nearly extraspecial 2-groups.

The particular almost-complex structures we will be considering are defined via the $2n \times 2n$ anti-Hermitian matrix M_{2n} of the form

$$M_{2n} = \sum_{i=1}^{2n} \epsilon(i)\, |i\rangle\langle\bar{i}|, \quad \bar{i} = 2n + 1 - i, \tag{3.10}$$

where the (generalized step functions) $\epsilon(i)$ satisfy Eqs. (2.1), and the Dirac kets $|i\rangle$ form an orthonormal basis. M_{2n} satisfies $(M_{2n})^2 = -1\!\!1_{2n}$ and $(M_{2n})^\dagger = -M_{2n}$. The matrix M_{2n} is only determined up to the n choices of signs for $\epsilon(i)$, $1 \le i \le n$. For any two such choices of signs, the corresponding matrices are related by conjugation by a diagonal matrix.

In terms of M_{2n}, two projectors P_+ and P_- are defined by

$$P_+ = \frac{1}{2}(1\!\!1_{2n} + \sqrt{-1}M_{2n}), \qquad P_- = \frac{1}{2}(1\!\!1_{2n} - \sqrt{-1}M_{2n}) \tag{3.11}$$

satisfying basic properties of two mutually orthogonal projectors,

$$P_+ + P_- = 1\!\!1_{2n}, \quad P_\pm^2 = P_\pm, \quad P_+P_- = P_-P_+ = 0. \tag{3.12}$$

In what follows, we construct two classes of representations $\phi_m^{(i)}$, $i = 1, 2$ for the group $\mathbf{E}_m$ in terms of the almost-complex structure M_{2n}.

Class (1): The almost-complex structure to be used is a $(2k)^2 \times (2k)^2$ matrix M^{JJ} with complex deformation parameters $q_{ij} \in \mathbb{C}$,

$$M^{JJ} = \sum_{i,j=-J}^{J} \epsilon(i) q_{ij} |ij\rangle\langle\bar{i}\bar{j}|, \quad \bar{i} = -i,\ \bar{j} = -j, \quad J = k - \frac{1}{2},\ k \in \mathbb{N} \tag{3.13}$$

which has been presented by Zhang and Ge [8] in terms of the matrix entries formalism for describing the GHZ states of an even number of objects. The $\epsilon(i)$ may be arbitrarily chosen subject to (2.1). We have the following:

Theorem 3.14. *Define a map $\phi_m^{(1)}$ on the generators of $\mathbf{E}_m$ in terms of M^{JJ} by:*

$$\phi_m^{(1)}(e_i) = 1\!\!1_{2k}^{\otimes i-1} \otimes M^{JJ} \otimes 1\!\!1_{2k}^{\otimes m-i}, \quad i = 1, \cdots, m. \tag{3.15}$$

Then $\phi_m^{(1)}$ defines a $(2k)^{m+1}$-dimensional unitary representation of $\mathbf{E}_m$ if, and only if, the parameters q_{ij} in M^{JJ} satisfy the following three constraints:

$$q_{ij}q_{\bar{i}\bar{j}} = 1, \quad q_{ij}q_{\bar{i}j} = q_{jl}q_{j\bar{l}}, \quad q_{ij}^* q_{ij} = 1. \tag{3.16}$$

Proof. It is clear that $\phi_m^{(1)}(e_i)\phi_m^{(1)}(e_j) = \phi_m^{(1)}(e_j)\phi_m^{(1)}(e_i)$ for $|i-j| > 1$. The first constraint is obtained from $(M^{JJ})^2 = -1\!\!1_{(2k)^2}$, the second from $\phi_m^{(1)}(e_i)\phi_m^{(1)}(e_{i+1}) = -\phi_m^{(1)}(e_{i+1})\phi_m^{(1)}(e_i)$, and the third from $(M^{JJ})^\dagger = -M^{JJ}$, see Appendix A for the details of the calculation. $\square$

In the spirit of separation of variables, we assume $q_{ij} = q_i q_j$ and $q_i \neq 0$ to obtain solutions of (3.16),

$$q_i q_{\bar{i}} = 1, \quad q_i^* = q_{\bar{i}}, \quad q_i \in \mathbb{C} \tag{3.17}$$

and recast M^{JJ} into a tensor product of two matrices M_{2k} and P_{2k},

$$M^{JJ} = M_{2k} \otimes P_{2k}, \quad M_{2k} = \sum_{i=-J}^{J} \epsilon(i) q_i |i\rangle\langle\bar{i}|, \ P_{2k} = \sum_{j=-J}^{J} q_j |j\rangle\langle\bar{j}|. \tag{3.18}$$

This shows that the construction of the high-dimensional unitary braid representation by Abdesselam *et al.* [25] is a special case of those given by Zhang and Ge [8], because the latter includes deformation parameters and the generalized step function. M_{2k} can be viewed as the generalized almost-complex structure since it has deformation parameters and satisfies $(M_{2k})^2 = -1\!\!1_{2k}$ and $(M_{2k})^\dagger = -M_{2k}$. The essential difference between M_{2k} and P_{2k} is that the latter one has no dependence on the generalized step function $\epsilon(i)$ which leads to

$$(P_{2k})^2 = 1\!\!1_{2k}, \quad (P_{2k})^\dagger = P_{2k}, \quad M_{2k}P_{2k} = -P_{2k}M_{2k}. \tag{3.19}$$

It is this anti-commutative relation between M_{2k} and P_{2k} that is used to verify the anti-commutative relations between the images of the generators of $\mathbf{E}_m$ under the representation associated to M^{JJ}. Similarly, $P_{2k} \otimes M_{2k}$ is the other form for M^{JJ} which will not be discussed here for simplicity.

In terms of k independent angle parameters φ_J, φ_{J-1}, $\cdots$, $\varphi_{\frac{1}{2}}$, the suitable unimodular deformation parameters q_i can be chosen

$$q_i = e^{i\frac{\varphi_i}{2}}, \quad q_{-i} = e^{-i\frac{\varphi_i}{2}}, \quad \frac{1}{2} \leq i \leq J, \tag{3.20}$$

which satisfy constraint equations (3.17). For example, a 4×4 matrix for the almost-complex structure $M^{\frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{2}}$ has the deformation parameters,

$$q_{\frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{2}} = e^{i\varphi}, \ q_{-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}} = e^{-i\varphi}, \ q_{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}} = q_{-\frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{2}} = 1, \tag{3.21}$$

and a 16×16 matrix for $M^{\frac{3}{2}\frac{3}{2}}$ has the deformation parameters,

$$\begin{aligned} &q_{\frac{3}{2}\frac{3}{2}} = e^{i\varphi_1}, \ q_{\frac{3}{2}\frac{1}{2}} = e^{i\frac{\varphi_1+\varphi_2}{2}}, \ q_{\frac{3}{2}-\frac{1}{2}} = e^{i\frac{\varphi_1-\varphi_2}{2}}, \ q_{\frac{3}{2}-\frac{3}{2}} = 1, \\ &q_{\frac{1}{2}\frac{3}{2}} = e^{i\frac{\varphi_1+\varphi_2}{2}}, \ q_{\frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{2}} = e^{i\varphi_2}, \ q_{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}} = 1, \ q_{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{3}{2}} = e^{i\frac{\varphi_2-\varphi_1}{2}}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.22}$$

It should be pointed out that the representation for $\mathbf{E}_m$ by M^{JJ} with unimodular deformation parameters q_{ij} is unitarily equivalent to those without deformation parameters (i.e., $q_{ij}=1$). To see this, introduce the new orthonormal basis $|i'\rangle$ by rescaling of the orthonormal basis $|i\rangle$,

$$|i'\rangle = q_i^{\frac{1}{2}}|i\rangle, \quad \langle j'| = \langle j|(q_j^*)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \langle i'|j'\rangle = \delta_{ij}, \quad |i'\rangle\langle\bar{i}'| = q_i|i\rangle\langle\bar{i}|. \tag{3.23}$$

Under this change of basis M_{2k} and P_{2k} do not depend on the unimodular deformation parameters:

$$M_{2k} = \sum_{i=-J}^{J} \epsilon(i)|i'\rangle\langle\bar{i}'|, \quad P_{2k} = \sum_{i=-J}^{J} |i'\rangle\langle\bar{i}'|. \tag{3.24}$$

This unitary change of basis can be effected globally on each $(2k)$-dimensional factor giving an equivalence of representations of $\mathbf{E}_m$ as required, please refer to Appendix B for details. For the purpose of understanding the representation theory, it will be convenient to use this parameter-free form of $\phi_m^{(1)}$.

On the other hand, these unimodular deformation parameters can be understood as phase factors which play key roles in quantum mechanics, for example, the angle variable φ at the deformation parameter $q_{\frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{2}}$ in $M^{\frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{2}}$ is explained as an angle parameter for the rotation in the Bloch sphere, see [3, 4]. In fact, these unimodular deformation parameters can have an interpretation in terms of geometric phases in quantum mechanics.

Class (2): There are two natural ways in which to generalize **Class (1)** in search of representations of $\mathbf{E}_m$. Firstly, we may consider more general almost-complex structures of the form $M_{2k_1} \otimes P_{2k_2}$ where $k_1 \neq k_2$. Secondly, as we mentioned in Subsection 2.1, we may use the generalized form of the braided YBE, where our almost-complex structure is promoted to spaces of different dimensions. Taken in tandem, this is a formidable problem. For simplicity and with an eye towards GHZ states, we consider a special case: $k_1 = 1$ and $k_2 = 2^{N-2}$, $N \geq 2$; thus the almost-complex structure is choosen to be $M_{2^N} \equiv M_2 \otimes P_{2^{N-1}} = \sqrt{-1}\sigma_y \otimes \sigma_x^{\otimes N-1}$. Having fixed this M_{2^N} we can construct another class of representations of $\mathbf{E}_m$, as summarized by the following main statement of ours:

Theorem 3.25. *Define a map* $\phi_m^{(2)}$ *into the set of unitary matrices* $\mathrm{U}(2^{N+k(m-1)})$ *on the generators of* $\mathbf{E}_m$ *by*

$$\phi_m^{(2)}(e_i) = \mathbb{1}_{2^k}^{\otimes i-1} \otimes \sqrt{-1}\sigma_y \otimes \sigma_x^{\otimes N-1} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{2^k}^{\otimes m-i}, \quad i = 1, \cdots, m. \tag{3.26}$$

Then $\phi_m^{(2)}$ *defines an (anti-Hermitian) representation of* $\mathbf{E}_m$ *for all* $m \geq 2$ *if and only if* $\frac{N}{2} \leq k \leq N-1$.

Proof. The fact that $\sqrt{-1}\sigma_y \otimes \sigma_x^{\otimes N-1}$ is an anti-Hermitian almost-complex structure implies that the matrices $\phi_m^{(2)}(e_i)$ are also anti-Hermitian and satisfy

$$\phi_m^{(2)}(e_i)\phi_m^{(2)}(e_i) = -\mathbb{1}_{2^{N+k(m-1)}}.$$

Direct calculation shows that $\phi_m^{(2)}(e_i)$ and $\phi_m^{(2)}(e_j)$ with $i \leq j$ anti-commute if and only if $1 \leq k(j-i) \leq N-1$, and commute if and only if $N-1 < k(j-i)$. Taking $j = i+1$ in the first conditiopn yields $1 \leq k \leq N-1$, while for $m \geq 3$ taking $j = i+2$ in the second condition produces $\frac{N}{2} \leq k \leq N-1$. For example, $\phi_2^{(2)}(e_1)$ anti-commuting with $\phi_2^{(2)}(e_2)$ is verified by the calculation

$$\begin{aligned}
&\phi_2^{(2)}(e_1)\phi_2^{(2)}(e_2) = (\sqrt{-1}\sigma_y \otimes \sigma_x^{\otimes N-1} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{2^k})(\mathbb{1}_{2^k} \otimes \sqrt{-1}\sigma_y \otimes \sigma_x^{\otimes N-1}) \\
&= \sqrt{-1}\sigma_y \otimes \sigma_x^{\otimes k-1} \otimes \sqrt{-1}\sigma_x\sigma_y \otimes \mathbb{1}_{2^{N-k-1}} \otimes \sigma_x^{\otimes k}, \\
&\phi_2^{(2)}(e_2)\phi_2^{(2)}(e_1) = (\mathbb{1}_{2^k} \otimes \sqrt{-1}\sigma_y \otimes \sigma_x^{\otimes N-1})(\sqrt{-1}\sigma_y \otimes \sigma_x^{\otimes N-1} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{2^k}) \\
&= \sqrt{-1}\sigma_y \otimes \sigma_x^{\otimes k-1} \otimes \sqrt{-1}\sigma_y\sigma_x \otimes \mathbb{1}_{2^{N-k-1}} \otimes \sigma_x^{\otimes k},
\end{aligned} \tag{3.27}$$

for $1 \leq k \leq N-1$. □

Remarks 3.28. Before moving on we point out the following:

1. Observe that for $\mathbf{E}_2$, $\phi_m^{(2)}$ is a representation for any $1 \leq k \leq N-1$, as there are only two (anti-commuting) generators.

2. Technically, $\phi_m^{(2)}$ is a 2-parameter family of representations depending on N and k, but we suppress this dependence for notational convenience.

3. Notice also that *not all* of almost-complex structures M_{2n} give rise to representations of $\mathbf{E}_m$ in the ways we are suggesting. For example, $M_{8,3} = (\sqrt{-1}\sigma_y)^{\otimes 3}$ satisfies $(M_{8,3})^2 = -\mathbb{1}_8$, but do not give rise to a representation of $\mathbf{E}_2$, due to the commutation relation $\phi_2^{(0)}(e_1)\phi_2^{(0)}(e_2){=}\phi_2^{(0)}(e_2)\phi_2^{(0)}(e_1)$. where

$$\phi_2^{(0)}(e_1) = (\sqrt{-1}\sigma_y)^{\otimes 3} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{2^k}, \quad \phi_2^{(0)}(e_2) = \mathbb{1}_{2^k} \otimes (\sqrt{-1}\sigma_y)^{\otimes 3}. \tag{3.29}$$

4. However, if the promotions of an almost complex-structure M do not satisfy the defining relations for $\mathbf{E}_m$ above this does not mean they cannot produce representations of $\mathbf{E}_m$, since there are other presentations of $\mathbf{E}_m$. For example the group defined on 4 generators f_i with $f_i^2 = -\mathbb{1}$ and $f_i f_j = -f_j f_i$ for each $1 \leq i, j \leq 4$ is an extraspecial 2-group. We are only interested in the defining relations $(E1)$, $(E2)$ and $(E3)$ as in Lemma 3.8 because these are convenient for applications to braid groups.

3.4 Unitary representations and images of $\mathcal{B}_n$

Unitary representations π_n of the braid group $\mathcal{B}_n$ can be obtained from the anti-Hermitian representations ϕ_{n-1} of $\mathbf{E}_{n-1}$ satisfying the hypotheses of Lemma 3.8 namely,

$$\pi_n(b_i) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\mathbb{1} + \phi_{n-1}(e_i)), \qquad \phi_{n-1}(e_i)^\dagger = -\phi_{n-1}(e_i). \tag{3.30}$$

where the dimension of the identity operator $\mathbb{1}$ is determined by the specific choice of $\phi_{n-1}(e_i)$ due to $\phi_{n-1}(e_i)^2 = -\mathbb{1}$.

Note the following key relations between $\pi_n(\mathcal{B}_n)$ and $\phi_n(\mathbf{E}_{n-1})$:

$$\begin{aligned}\pi_n(b_i)\phi_{n-1}(e_{i\pm1})\pi_n(b_i)^{-1} &= \phi_{n-1}(e_{i\pm1})\phi_{n-1}(e_i),\\ \pi_n(b_i)\phi_{n-1}(e_j)\pi_n(b_i)^{-1} &= \phi_{n-1}(e_j)\end{aligned}\tag{3.31}$$

where $1 \leq i \pm 1 \leq n-1$ and $|i-j| \geq 2$. Observing that $[\pi_n(b_i)]^2 = \phi_{n-1}(e_i)$ these relations immediately imply that $H_n = \pi_n(\mathcal{P}_n) = \phi_{n-1}(\mathbf{E}_{n-1})$ since $\mathcal{P}_n$ is generated by the conjugates of $(b_i)^2$.

Now let us show that the braid group image G_n is an extension of $\mathbf{E}_{n-1}$ by the symmetric group $\mathcal{S}_n$, in the same manner as discussed in [5]. We must show that the surjective homomorphism $\pi'_n : \mathcal{S}_n \to G_n/H_n$ is in fact a bijection. For this consider the standard homomorphism $\vartheta : G_n \to \mathrm{Aut}(H_n)$ where $\vartheta(G_n)$ acts by conjugation (explicitly by (3.31)). The map ϑ induces a homomorphism $\overline{\vartheta} : G_n/H_n \to \mathrm{Out}(H_n) = \mathrm{Aut}(H_n)/\mathrm{Inn}(H_n)$ since $\vartheta(H_n) = \mathrm{Inn}(H_n)$. Clearly $\mathrm{Inn}(H_n)$ acts on H_n by sign changes. To show that π'_n is injective, it is enough to show that $\overline{\vartheta}\circ\pi'_n : \mathcal{S}_n \to \mathrm{Out}(H_n)$ is injective, i.e. $\ker(\overline{\vartheta}\circ\pi'_n) \lhd S_n$ is trivial. Since the only nontrivial proper normal subgroup of $\mathcal{S}_n$ is A_n for $n \geq 5$, it is enough to show that the images of the permutations (12), (123) and (12)(34) (for $n = 4$) under $\overline{\vartheta}$ are nontrivial–easily accomplished using (3.31). Thus we have an exact sequence:

$$\mathbb{1} \to H_n \to G_n \to \mathcal{S}_n \to \mathbb{1},\tag{3.32}$$

for all $n \geq 2$, where $H_n \to G_n$ is inclusion and $G_n \to \mathcal{S}_n$ is induced by the quotient map and the isomorphism π'_n.

3.5 Decomposition into irreducible representations of $\mathcal{B}_n$

We proceed to determine the decomposition of the above braid group representations π_n obtained from the representations $\phi_{n-1}^{(i)}$ $(i = 1, 2)$ of $\mathbf{E}_{n-1}$ into irreducible constituents. With the formulas for the representations ρ_1, λ_1 and λ_2 given in Subsection 3.2 of the group $\mathbf{E}_{n-1}$ in hand, one can easily compute their (obviously irreducible) extensions $\hat{\rho}_1$, $\hat{\lambda}_1$ and $\hat{\lambda}_2$ to $\mathcal{B}_n$. For example, the explicit matrix realization for the irreducible representation $\hat{\rho}_1$ has the form

$$\begin{aligned}&\hat{\rho}_1(b_{2i}) = \mathbb{1}_2^{\otimes i-1} \otimes B_2 \otimes \mathbb{1}_2^{\otimes k-i}, \quad \hat{\rho}_1(b_{2i+1}) = \mathbb{1}_2^{\otimes i-1} \otimes D_2 \otimes \mathbb{1}_2^{\otimes k-i-1},\\ &\hat{\rho}_1(b_1) = D_1 \otimes \mathbb{1}_2^{\otimes k-1}, \qquad \hat{\rho}_1(b_{2k}) = \mathbb{1}_2^{\otimes k-1} \otimes B_2,\end{aligned}\tag{3.33}$$

where the matrices D_1, D_2 and B_2 are given by

$$D_1 = \zeta \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{-1} \end{pmatrix}, \; D_2 = \begin{pmatrix} D_1 & 0 \\ 0 & D_1^* \end{pmatrix}, \; B_2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ -1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}\tag{3.34}$$

satisfying $D_1^2 = \sqrt{-1}\sigma_z$, $D_2^2 = \sqrt{-1}\ \sigma_z^{\otimes 2}$ and $(B_2)^2 = \sqrt{-1}\sigma_y$, and $\zeta = e^{i\frac{\pi}{4}}$. (See [5] for details.)

Now we want to extend the above results to the case when the Bell matrix B_4 is replaced by the generalized Bell matrix B_{2k} defined in [8] (or what we called an $\check{R}$-matrix above). In our notations, the matrix B_{2k} is given in terms of the almost-complex structure M_{2k} (as in Lemma 3.8) by

$$B_{2k} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\mathbb{1}_{2k} + M_{2k}) = e^{\frac{\pi}{4}M_{2k}}. \tag{3.35}$$

And (reducible and unitary) representations of the braid group $\mathcal{B}_n$ can be constructed from B_{2k} by

$$\pi_n(b_i) = \mathbb{1}^{\otimes i-1} \otimes B_{2k} \otimes \mathbb{1}^{\otimes n-i-1}, \tag{3.36}$$

where the dimension of the identity operator relies on the specific representations. We have seen that M_{2k} has two classes of realizations, i.e., **Class (1)** and **Class (2)**. In both cases, the matrix B_{2k} has two distinct eigenvalues ζ and ζ^*, satisfying the characteristic equation,

$$(B_{2k} - \zeta\ \mathbb{1}_{2k})(B_{2k} - \zeta^*\ \mathbb{1}_{2k}) = 0, \tag{3.37}$$

so that both B_{2k} and its inverse are linear combinations of the projectors $P_\pm$ (3.11):

$$B_{2k} = \zeta^* P_+ + \zeta P_-, \qquad B_{2k}^{-1} = \zeta^* P_- + \zeta P_+. \tag{3.38}$$

Hence looking for irreducible representations for the braid group image G_n is a two-eigenvalue problem, which has been systematically studied by Freedman, Larsen and Wang [29]. However, direct application of the theory of finite group representations as in [5] is more efficient since we have Lemma 3.8 at our disposal.

We consider **Class (1)** and **Class (2)** simultaneously, so that the representation π_n is induced from $\phi^{(i)}_{n-1}$ with $i = 1$ or $i = 2$. Observe that the hypotheses of Lemma 3.8 are satisfied by $\phi^{(i)}_{n-1}$. First let us consider the decomposition of π_n of $\mathcal{B}_n$ with n odd, so that the restriction of π_n to $\mathcal{P}_n$ factors over the representation $\phi^{(i)}_{n-1}$ of $\mathbf{E}_{n-1}$ with $n-1$ even. Set $d_i^o = \frac{\dim(\phi^{(i)}_{n-1})}{2^{(n-1)/2}}$. Then Lemma 3.8(d) implies that $\phi^{(i)}_{n-1}$ decomposes into irreducible subrepresentations as d_i^o copies of the $2^{(n-1)/2}$-dimensional irreducible $\mathbf{E}_{n-1}$-representation (ρ_1, V_1). Thus π_n decomposes as d_i^o copies of $\hat{\rho}_1$ as representations of $\mathcal{B}_n$. Now consider n even, and set $d_i^e = \frac{\dim(\phi^{(i)}_{n-1})}{2^{n/2}}$. It was observed in [5] that:

$$\mathrm{Res}^{\mathbf{E}_n}_{\mathbf{E}_{n-1}}(\rho_1, V_1) = (\lambda_1, W_1) \oplus (\lambda_2, W_2).$$

This together with Lemma 3.8(a) shows that $\phi^{(i)}_{n-1}$ decomposes as a representation of $\mathbf{E}_{n-1}$ into d_i^e copies of $\lambda_1 \oplus \lambda_2$ where λ_i, $i = 1, 2$ are the two inequivalent irreducible representations of $\mathbf{E}_{n-1}$ with n even with $\dim(\lambda_i) = 2^{(n-2)/2}$. Thus the $\mathcal{B}_n$ representation π_n with n even decomposes as d_i^e copies of $\hat{\lambda}_1 \oplus \hat{\lambda}_2$. For completeness, let us recall that $\dim(\phi^{(1)}_{n-1}) = (2k)^n$ and $\dim(\phi^{(2)}_{n-1}) = 2^{N+k(n-2)}$ so that $d^o_1 = k^n 2^{(n+1)/2}$ and $d^o_2 = 2^{N+k(n-2)-(n-1)/2}$ with d^e_i computed similarly.

Due to the obvious analogy between the irreducible decompositions of the unitary braid representations constructed above and the special case analyzed in [5], on can easily see that by the renormalization of the generalized Bell matrices B_{2k} of [5, Section 5] one obtains representations of groups related to our nearly extraspecial 2-groups, and, more importantly, to the Jones representation of the braid group at the 4-th root of unity. From this we conclude, as in [5], that 1) there are link-invariants associated to the sequence of representations π_n and 2) they contain the same topological information as the Jones polynomials at a 4-th root of unity, that is, they distinguish links precisely as the *Arf* invariant of a link [20, 21] does.

4 GHZ states and unitary evolution of GHZ states

In [8], it is shown that GHZ states can be obtained from the unitary braid representations, constructed in terms of the representations of extraspecial 2-groups. In the following, complexities among GHZ states, unitary basis change matrices and unitary braid representations will be made clear. Besides these elaborations, Yang–Baxterization [13, 14] are exploited to determine unitary evolution of GHZ states with specific Hamiltonians.

4.1 Unitary basis transformation matrices

The two dimensional Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_2$ spanned by eigenvectors $|m\rangle, m = \pm\frac{1}{2}$ of the spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ operators (i.e. Pauli matrices, for example, $\sigma_z|\pm\frac{1}{2}\rangle = \pm|\pm\frac{1}{2}\rangle$), has the following realization of coordinate vectors over the complex field $\mathbb{C}^2$,

$$|\frac{1}{2}\rangle := \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad |-\frac{1}{2}\rangle := \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \alpha|\frac{1}{2}\rangle + \beta|-\frac{1}{2}\rangle = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \end{pmatrix}, \tag{4.1}$$

which determine actions of $\sqrt{-1}\sigma_y$ and σ_x on the basis $|m\rangle$,

$$\sigma_x|m\rangle = |\bar{m}\rangle, \quad \sqrt{-1}\sigma_y|m\rangle = \epsilon'(m)|\bar{m}\rangle, \quad \bar{m} = -m, \quad m = \pm\frac{1}{2} \tag{4.2}$$

with the step function $\epsilon'(\frac{1}{2}) = -\epsilon'(-\frac{1}{2}) = -1$. A state vector in this $\mathcal{H}_2$ is usually called a qubit in quantum information theory [9], and $\mathcal{H}_2 \cong \mathbb{C}^2$.

The Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{2^N}$ is isomorphic to $(\mathbb{C}^2)^{\otimes N}$ and describes a physical system consisting of N qubits, each qubit with two linearly independent states (up or down). It has an orthonormal basis denoted by Dirac kets $|\Phi_k\rangle$, $1 \le k \le 2^N$ which are tensor products of $|\pm\frac{1}{2}\rangle$ by

$$|\Phi_k\rangle \equiv |m_1, \cdots, m_N\rangle \equiv |m_1\rangle \otimes \cdots \otimes |m_N\rangle, \quad m_1, \cdots, m_N = \pm\frac{1}{2}. \tag{4.3}$$

Here the lower index k is a given function of $m_1, \cdots m_N$, see [30],

$$k[m_1, \cdots, m_N] = 2^{N-1} + \frac{1}{2} - \sum_{i=1}^{N} 2^{N-i}\, m_i, \tag{4.4}$$

so that in coordinates

$$|\Phi_k\rangle = (\underbrace{0, \cdots, 0}_{k-1}, 1, \underbrace{0, \cdots, 0}_{2^N-k})^T, \tag{4.5}$$

with the upper index T denoting the transposition of a matrix.

This orthonormal basis $|\Phi_k\rangle$ is partitioned into two sets respectively denoted by Dirac kets $|\Phi_l\rangle$ and $|\Phi_{\bar{l}}\rangle$, $1 \le l \le 2^{N-1}$ and $\bar{l} = 2^N - l + 1$,

$$|\Phi_l\rangle = |m_1, \cdots, m_N\rangle, \quad |\Phi_{\bar{l}}\rangle = |\bar{m}_1, \cdots, \bar{m}_N\rangle, \quad \bar{m}_i = -m_i,\ 1 \le l \le N. \tag{4.6}$$

In terms of $|\Phi_l\rangle$ and $|\Phi_{\bar{l}}\rangle$, the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{2^N}$ is spanned by the 2^N orthonormal GHZ states $|\Psi_l\rangle$ of N qubits,

$$|\Psi_l\rangle \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\Phi_l\rangle + |\Phi_{\bar{l}}\rangle), \quad |\Psi_{\bar{l}}\rangle \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\Phi_l\rangle - |\Phi_{\bar{l}}\rangle). \tag{4.7}$$

These GHZ states are typical, maximally entangled states that have been widely used in quantum information theory [17, 18, 19]. The set of all GHZ states forms an orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{H}_{2^N}$ as does the orthonormal basis given by unitary transformations of GHZ states $|\Psi'_k\rangle = U|\Psi_k\rangle$ with a fixed unitary transformation U. The unitary basis transformation matrix from the product basis $|\Phi_k\rangle$ to the orthonormal basis $|\Psi'_k\rangle$ takes the form

$$(|\Psi'_1\rangle, |\Psi'_2\rangle, \cdots, |\Psi'_{2^N}\rangle). \tag{4.8}$$

With $U|\Psi_k\rangle = e^{i\phi_k}|\Psi_k\rangle$, this unitary basis transformation matrix has the same form as that exploited by Fujii, Oike and Suzuki [30],

$$(e^{i\phi_1}|\Psi_1\rangle, e^{i\phi_2}|\Psi_2\rangle, \cdots, e^{i\phi_{2^N}}|\Psi_{2^N}\rangle). \tag{4.9}$$

However, it does not usually give rise to unitary braid representations that we are interested in for the purpose of topological quantum computing.

As an example, we study the Hilbert space $\mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^2$ for two qubits in which GHZ states are well known Bell states. In terms of the orthonormal tensor product basis $|\Phi_k\rangle$, $k = 1, \cdots, 4$,

$$\begin{aligned} &|\Phi_1\rangle = |\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\rangle, \quad |\Phi_4\rangle = |\Phi_{\bar{1}}\rangle = |-\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}\rangle, \\ &|\Phi_2\rangle = |\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}\rangle, \quad |\Phi_3\rangle = |\Phi_{\bar{2}}\rangle = |-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\rangle, \end{aligned} \tag{4.10}$$

where the numbering for lower indices is consistent with the convention (4.4),

$$k[\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}]=1,\ k[\frac{1}{2},-\frac{1}{2}]=2,\ k[-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}]=3,\ k[-\frac{1}{2},-\frac{1}{2}]=4, \tag{4.11}$$

Bell states have the same formulations as their conventions,

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi_1\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\Phi_1\rangle + |\Phi_{\bar{1}}\rangle), \quad |\Psi_4\rangle = |\Psi_{\bar{1}}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\Phi_1\rangle - |\Phi_{\bar{1}}\rangle), \\ |\Psi_2\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\Phi_2\rangle + |\Phi_{\bar{2}}\rangle), \quad |\Psi_3\rangle = |\Psi_{\bar{2}}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\Phi_2\rangle - |\Phi_{\bar{2}}\rangle). \end{aligned} \tag{4.12}$$

The unitary basis transformation matrix from $|\Phi_k\rangle$ to the orthornormal basis $e^{i\phi_k}|\Psi_k\rangle$ has the form

$$\begin{aligned} & (e^{i\phi_1}|\Psi_1\rangle, e^{i\phi_2}|\Psi_2\rangle, e^{i\phi_3}|\Psi_3\rangle, e^{i\phi_4}|\Psi_4\rangle) \\ = & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(\begin{array}{cccc} e^{i\phi_1} & 0 & 0 & e^{i\phi_4} \\ 0 & e^{i\phi_2} & e^{i\phi_3} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\phi_2} & -e^{i\phi_3} & 0 \\ e^{i\phi_1} & 0 & 0 & -e^{i\phi_4} \end{array} \right). \end{aligned} \tag{4.13}$$

At $\phi_1 = 0, \phi_3 = \pi$ and $\phi_2 = \phi_4 = -\frac{1}{2}\pi$, it is called the magic matrix [30] or Makhlin matrix [31] but does not satisfy the braid group relation (2.7).

4.2 Unitary braid representations for GHZ states

It has been suggested in ref. [8] that these GHZ states $|\Psi_l\rangle$ (4.7) can be generated by the action of a higher dimensional Bell matrices on the product basis $|\Phi_l\rangle$ and $|\Phi_{\bar{l}}\rangle$. In the following, we will clarify several subtleties on the delicate connection between GHZ states and unitary braid representations.

4.2.1 An even number of qubits

We start with the GHZ states of an *even* number of qubits, say $2n$ qubits. It is associated to the generalized Bell matrix B^{JJ} in terms of the almost-complex structure M^{JJ} in **Class(1)**,

$$B^{JJ} = 1\!\!1_{(2k)^2} + M^{JJ}, \quad J = k - \frac{1}{2}, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{4.14}$$

An important point to clarify is that B^{JJ} is a $(2k)^2 \times (2k)^2$ matrix, while the dimension of the Hilbert space spanned by the GHZ states of $2n$ qubits is 2^{2n}. So for the GHZ states generated by B^{JJ} to *span* a 2^{2n}-dimensional Hilbert space, one needs J to be $J = 2^{n-1} - \frac{1}{2}$.

Therefore, the almost-complex structure M^{JJ} in **Class (1)** has the form

$$M^{JJ} = M_{2k} \otimes P_{2k} = M_{2^n} \otimes P_{2^n}, \quad J = 2^{n-1} - \frac{1}{2}, \quad k = 2^n \tag{4.15}$$

which can be reformulated to be

$$M^{JJ}=\sum_{i,j=-J}^{J}\epsilon(i)q_iq_j|ij\rangle\langle\bar{i}\bar{j}|=\sum_{\mu,\nu=1}^{2^n}\epsilon(\mu)q_\mu q_\nu|\mu\nu\rangle\langle\bar{\mu}\bar{\nu}| \tag{4.16}$$

with the generalized step function satisfying $\epsilon(\mu)\epsilon(\bar{\mu})=-1$, $\epsilon(\nu)\epsilon(\bar{\nu})=-1$ and

$$\bar{\mu}=2^n+1-\mu,\ \bar{\nu}=2^n+1-\nu,\quad q_\mu=e^{i\frac{\varphi_\mu}{2}},\ q_{\bar{\mu}}=e^{-i\frac{\varphi_\mu}{2}}. \tag{4.17}$$

Let the orthonormal bases $|\mu\rangle$ (or $|\nu\rangle$) and $|\mu\nu\rangle$ have forms in terms of the orthonormal basis $|\Phi_k\rangle$ (4.5) for the 2^n-dimensional Hilbert space,

$$|\mu\rangle:=|\Phi_\mu\rangle,\quad|\nu\rangle:=|\Phi_\nu\rangle,\quad|\alpha\rangle:=|\mu\nu\rangle=|\Phi_{(\mu-1)2^n+\nu}\rangle. \tag{4.18}$$

As the Bell matrix B^{JJ} in **Class (1)** acts on the orthonormal basis $|\alpha\rangle$, the result will be the unitary transformation of GHZ states in the 2^{2n}-dimensional Hilbert space, i.e.,

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\alpha\rangle+\epsilon(\mu)e^{i\frac{\varphi_\mu+\varphi_\nu}{2}}|\bar{\alpha}\rangle), \tag{4.19}$$

because of

$$\alpha+\bar{\alpha}=(\mu-1)2^n+\nu+(\bar{\mu}-1)2^n+\bar{\nu}=2^{2n}+1, \tag{4.20}$$

consistent with the definition of GHZ states in terms of $|\Phi_l\rangle$ and $|\Phi_{\bar{l}}\rangle$, see (4.7).

As the first example for **Class (1)**, at $J=\frac{1}{2}$ or $n=1$, the Bell matrix $B_{4,2}^{\frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{2}}$ has the form given by

$$B_{4,2}^{\frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{2}}\equiv\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(1\!\!1_4+M_2\otimes P_2)=\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\begin{pmatrix}1&0&0&e^{i\varphi}\\0&1&1&0\\0&-1&1&0\\-e^{-i\varphi}&0&0&1\end{pmatrix} \tag{4.21}$$

where the unimodular deformation parameters take the convention (3.21). This is a unitary basis transformation matrix from the product basis $|\Phi_k\rangle$ to the orthonormal basis by unitary transformations of Bell states $|\Psi_k\rangle$ (4.12),

$$B_{4,2}^{\frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{2}}=((1\!\!1_2\otimes u_{0,-\varphi})|\Psi_4\rangle,|\Psi_3\rangle,|\Psi_2\rangle,(1\!\!1_2\otimes u_{\varphi,0})|\Psi_1\rangle) \tag{4.22}$$

where two unitary matrices $u_{0,-\varphi}$ and $u_{\varphi,0}$ have the forms

$$u_{0,-\varphi}=\begin{pmatrix}1&0\\0&e^{-i\varphi}\end{pmatrix},\quad u_{\varphi,0}=\begin{pmatrix}e^{i\varphi}&0\\0&1\end{pmatrix}. \tag{4.23}$$

In addition, the other 4×4 Bell matrix $B_{4,1}^{\frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{2}}\equiv\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(1\!\!1_4+P_2\otimes M_2)$ is recognized to be the unitary basis transformation matrix given by

$$B_{4,1}^{\frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{2}}=((1\!\!1_2\otimes u_{0,-\varphi})|\Psi_4\rangle,|\Psi_2\rangle,|\Psi_3\rangle,(1\!\!1_2\otimes u_{\varphi,0})|\Psi_1\rangle). \tag{4.24}$$

In the second example for **Class (1)**, unimodular deformation parameters are chosen to be 1, and the almost-complex structure M_{2^n}, and P_{2^n} take the forms

$$M_{2^n} = \sqrt{-1}\sigma_y \otimes \sigma_x^{\otimes n}, \quad P_{2^n} = \sigma_x^{\otimes n}, \tag{4.25}$$

which give rise to the unitary braid representation $B_{2^{2n}}^{JJ}$,

$$B_{2^{2n}}^{JJ} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(1\!\!1_{2^{2n}} + M_{2^{2n}}^{JJ}), \quad M_{2^{2n}}^{JJ} = \sqrt{-1}\sigma_y \otimes \sigma_x^{\otimes 2n-1}. \tag{4.26}$$

The GHZ states of $2n$ qubits obtained by the corresponding Bell matrix on the orthonormal product basis $|\Phi_k\rangle$ with the step function $\epsilon'(m_1)$ (4.2) are

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|m_1, \cdots, m_{2n}\rangle + \epsilon'(m_1)|\bar{m}_1, \cdots, \bar{m}_{2n}\rangle) \tag{4.27}$$

which leads to the unitary basis transformation matrix,

$$B_{2^{2n}}^{JJ} = (|\Psi_{2^{2n}}\rangle, |\Psi_{2^{2n}-1}\rangle, \cdots, |\Psi_2\rangle, |\Psi_1\rangle). \tag{4.28}$$

4.2.2 An odd number of qubits

Obviously, unitary braid representations in **Class (1)** can not yield the GHZ states of an odd number, say $2n+1$, of qubits. But the unitary braid representations in **Class (2)** can, via the matrices

$$B_{2^{2n+1}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(1\!\!1_{2^{2n+1}} + M_{2^{2n+1}}), \quad M_{2^{2n+1}} = \sqrt{-1}\sigma_y \otimes (\sigma_x)^{\otimes 2n}, \tag{4.29}$$

without unimodular deformation parameters and generalized step functions. It is worthwhile clarifying the essential differences between unitary braid representations in **Class (1)** and **Class (2)**: every strand for the braid group in **Class (1)** lives in the same dimensional vector space, whereas this is not always true in **Class (2)**, *e.g.*, for the Bell matrix $B_{2^{2n+1}}$. On the other hand, the unitary braid representation $B_{2^{2n}}$ in **Class (2)** can be regarded as a sort of generalization of $B_{2^{2n}}^{JJ}$ in **Class (1)**, because our proof for **Class (2)** suggests that strands are allowed to have distinct dimensions as well as the same dimension.

The GHZ states of $2n+1$ qubits generated by the Bell matrix $B_{2^{2n+1}}$ in **Class (2)** acting on the product basis $|\Phi_l\rangle$ and $|\Phi_{\bar{l}}\rangle$ have a similar form as shown in (4.27), and $B_{2^{2n+1}}$ represents the unitary basis transformation matrix by

$$B_{2^{2n+1}} = (|\Psi_{2^{2n+1}}\rangle, |\Psi_{2^{2n}}\rangle, \cdots, |\Psi_2\rangle, |\Psi_1\rangle). \tag{4.30}$$

For example, on the product basis $|\Phi_l\rangle$ for three qubits given by

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\Phi_1\rangle = |\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\rangle, \quad |\Phi_8\rangle = |\Phi_{\bar{1}}\rangle = |-\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}\rangle \\
&|\Phi_2\rangle = |\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}\rangle, \quad |\Phi_7\rangle = |\Phi_{\bar{2}}\rangle = |-\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\rangle, \\
&|\Phi_3\rangle = |\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\rangle, \quad |\Psi_6\rangle = |\Phi_{\bar{3}}\rangle = |-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}\rangle, \\
&|\Phi_4\rangle = |\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}\rangle, \quad |\Phi_5\rangle = |\Phi_{\bar{4}}\rangle = |-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\rangle,
\end{aligned} \tag{4.31}$$

the Bell matrix $B_{8,2}$ in terms of $M_{8,2} = \sqrt{-1}\sigma_y \otimes \sigma_x^{\otimes 2}$ having the form

$$B_{8,2} = e^{\frac{\pi}{4} i\sigma_y \otimes \sigma_x^{\otimes 2}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \tag{4.32}$$

produces all the GHZ states $|\Psi_l\rangle$ of three qubits [17, 18, 19] which take the conventional formulations

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi_1\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\Phi_1\rangle + |\Phi_8\rangle), \quad |\Psi_{\bar{1}}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\Phi_1\rangle - |\Phi_8\rangle) \\ |\Psi_2\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\Phi_2\rangle + |\Phi_7\rangle), \quad |\Psi_{\bar{2}}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\Phi_2\rangle - |\Phi_7\rangle) \\ |\Psi_3\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\Phi_3\rangle + |\Phi_6\rangle), \quad |\Psi_{\bar{3}}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\Phi_3\rangle - |\Phi_5\rangle) \\ |\Psi_4\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\Phi_4\rangle + |\Phi_5\rangle), \quad |\Psi_{\bar{4}}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\Phi_4\rangle - |\Phi_5\rangle), \end{aligned} \tag{4.33}$$

and also $B_{8,2}$ denotes a unitary basis transformation matrix from $|\Phi_l\rangle$ to $|\Psi_l\rangle$,

$$B_{8,2} \equiv (|\Psi_{\bar{1}}\rangle, |\Psi_{\bar{2}}\rangle, |\Psi_{\bar{3}}\rangle, |\Psi_{\bar{4}}\rangle, |\Psi_4\rangle, |\Psi_3\rangle, |\Psi_2\rangle, |\Psi_1\rangle). \tag{4.34}$$

Similarly $B_{8,1}$ for GHZ states of three qubits has the form

$$B_{8,1} \equiv e^{i\frac{\pi}{4}\sigma_x^{\otimes 2} \otimes \sigma_y} = (|\Psi_{\bar{1}}\rangle, |\Psi_2\rangle, |\Psi_{\bar{3}}\rangle, |\Psi_4\rangle, -|\Psi_{\bar{4}}\rangle, |\Psi_3\rangle, -|\Psi_{\bar{2}}\rangle, |\Psi_1\rangle). \tag{4.35}$$

Note that the first subscript in the Bell matrix $B_{4,1}, B_{4,2}$ or $B_{8,1}, B_{8,2}$ represents the dimension of the matrix, while the second labels different matrices with the same dimension.

Remark 4.36. There are other unitary matrices producing all the GHZ states from the product basis but which do not give braid representations. For example, the following unitary matrix $B_{8,3}$ in terms of $M_{8,3} = (\sqrt{-1}\sigma_y)^{\otimes 3}$, see (3.29),

$$B_{8,3} \equiv e^{-i\frac{\pi}{4}\sigma_y^{\otimes 3}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \tag{4.37}$$

which does not generate a braid representation but indeed generates all the GHZ states of three qubits from the product basis just as $B_{8,2}$ does.

4.3 Unitary evolution of GHZ states

Unitary evolution of GHZ states as well as the corresponding Schödinger equation can be explored with the help of Yang–Baxterization [13, 14], and this is a systematic elaboration of previous research work. Unitary evolution of Bell states have been discussed in detail [3, 4], while unitary evolution of GHZ states have been only briefly sketched in [8].

The quantum Yang–Baxter equation (QYBE) has the form

$$\check{R}_i(x)\,\check{R}_{i+1}(xy)\,\check{R}_i(y) = \check{R}_{i+1}(y)\,\check{R}_i(xy)\,\check{R}_{i+1}(x) \tag{4.38}$$

with the spectral parameters x and y. In view of the fact that $\check{R}(x=0)$ forms a braid representation, the braid group relation (2.7) is also called the braided YBE. Concerning this relation between braid representations and x-dependent solutions of the QYBE (4.38), the procedure of constructing the $\check{R}(x)$-matrix from a given (constant) braid image b-matrix is called Baxterization [13] or Yang–Baxterization [14]. For a b-matrix with two distinct eigenvalues λ_1 and λ_2, the corresponding $\check{R}(x)$-matrix via Yang–Baxterization is given by

$$\check{R}(x) = b + x\lambda_1\lambda_2 b^{-1}; \tag{4.39}$$

please refer to Appendix A of the paper [4] for the detail.

For the unitary braid representation B in terms of the almost-complex structure M (3.10), it has two distinct eigenvalues ζ and ζ^* and satisfies the characteristic equation (3.37). Using Yang–Baxterization, a solution of the QYBE (4.38) with the asymptotic limit B, is

$$\check{R}(x) = B + xB^{-1} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(1+x)\mathbb{1} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(1-x)M. \tag{4.40}$$

where the lower indices of $B, M, \mathbb{1}$ are suppressed for convenience, see Appendix C for details. This $\check{R}(x)$-matrix can be updated to be a unitary matrix $B(x)$ by adding a normalization factor $\rho(x)$, i.e.,

$$B(x) = \rho^{-\frac{1}{2}}\check{R}(x), \qquad \rho = 1+x^2,\ x \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{4.41}$$

As the real spectral parameter x plays the role of the time variable, the Schrödinger equation describing the unitary evolution of a state $\psi(0)$ (independent of x) determined by the $B(x)$ matrix, i.e., $\psi(x) = B(x)\psi(0)$, has the form

$$\sqrt{-1}\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\psi(x) = H(x)\psi(x), \qquad H(x) \equiv \sqrt{-1}\frac{\partial B(x)}{\partial x}B^{-1}(x), \tag{4.42}$$

where the time-dependent Hamiltonian $H(x)$ is given by

$$H(x) = \sqrt{-1}\frac{\partial}{\partial x}(\rho^{-\frac{1}{2}}\check{R}(x))(\rho^{-\frac{1}{2}}\check{R}(x))^{-1} = -\sqrt{-1}\rho^{-1}M. \tag{4.43}$$

To construct the time-independent Hamiltonian, the spectral parameter x is replaced by a new time variable θ by the change of variables

$$\cos\theta = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+x^2}}, \qquad \sin\theta = \frac{x}{\sqrt{1+x^2}}, \tag{4.44}$$

so that the unitary matrix $B(x)$ has a new formulation in terms of θ,

$$B(\theta) = \cos\theta B + \sin\theta B^{-1} = e^{(\frac{\pi}{4}-\theta)M}, \tag{4.45}$$

and hence the Schrödinger equation for the time evolution of $\psi(\theta) = B(\theta)\psi(0)$ is given by

$$\sqrt{-1}\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta}\psi(\theta) = H\psi(\theta), \qquad H \equiv \sqrt{-1}\frac{\partial B(\theta)}{\partial\theta}B^{-1}(\theta) = -\sqrt{-1}M, \tag{4.46}$$

where the time-independent Hamiltonian H is Hermitian since the almost-complex structure M is anti-Hermitian. The unitary time-evolution operator $U(\theta)$ has the form $U(\theta)$=$e^{-\theta M}$. Furthermore, with the shifted time variable θ', unitary matrices $B(\theta')$ and $U(\theta')$ take the same form,

$$B(\theta') = U(\theta') = e^{-\theta' M}, \quad \theta' = \theta - \frac{\pi}{4}. \tag{4.47}$$

In **Class (1)** , Yang–Baxterization of the Bell matrix B^{JJ} for GHZ states of $2n$ qubits has the form

$$B^{JJ}(\theta') = \cos\theta' 1\!\!1_{2^{2n}} - \sin\theta' M_{2^n} \otimes P_{2^n} \tag{4.48}$$

which leads to the unitary evolution of the GHZ state $|\alpha\rangle$ (4.18) given by

$$B^{JJ}(\theta')|\alpha\rangle = \cos\theta'|\alpha\rangle - \sin\theta'\epsilon(\mu)e^{\frac{\varphi_\mu+\varphi_v}{2}}|\bar{\alpha}\rangle \tag{4.49}$$

related to the Hamiltonian $H^{JJ} = -\sqrt{-1}M_{2^n} \otimes P_{2^n}$. For example, at $J = \frac{1}{2}$ or $n = 1$, Yang–Baxterization of the Bell matrices $B^{\frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{2}}_{4,1}$ and $B^{\frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{2}}_{4,2}$ denoted by $B^{\frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{2}}_{4,\pm}$ are obtained to be

$$\begin{aligned} B^{\frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{2}}_{4,+}(\theta') &\equiv B^{\frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{2}}_{4,2}(\theta') = \cos\theta' 1\!\!1_4 - \sin\theta' M_2 \otimes P_2, \\ B^{\frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{2}}_{4,-}(\theta') &\equiv B^{\frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{2}}_{4,1}(\theta') = \cos\theta' 1\!\!1_4 - \sin\theta' P_2 \otimes M_2 \end{aligned} \tag{4.50}$$

where M_2 and P_2 have the forms in terms of $\sigma_\varphi \equiv \cos\varphi\sigma_x + \sin\varphi\sigma_y$, i.e.,

$$M_2 = \left(\begin{array}{cc} 0 & e^{i\frac{\varphi}{2}} \\ -e^{-i\frac{\varphi}{2}} & 0 \end{array}\right) = \sqrt{-1}\sigma_{\frac{\pi-\varphi}{2}}, \qquad P_2 = \left(\begin{array}{cc} 0 & e^{i\frac{\varphi}{2}} \\ e^{-i\frac{\varphi}{2}} & 0 \end{array}\right) = \sigma_{-\frac{\varphi}{2}}, \tag{4.51}$$

and the Hamiltonians $H^{\frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{2}}_{4,\pm}$ found to have the similar forms as those [3, 4]

$$H^{\frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{2}}_{4,+} = \sigma_{\frac{\pi-\varphi}{2}} \otimes \sigma_{-\frac{\varphi}{2}}, \quad H^{\frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{2}}_{4,-} = \sigma_{-\frac{\varphi}{2}} \otimes \sigma_{\frac{\pi-\varphi}{2}} \tag{4.52}$$

determine unitary evolution of Bell states given by

$$B_{4,\pm}^{\frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{2}} \left(\begin{array}{c} |\frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{2}\rangle \\ |\frac{1}{2}\frac{-1}{2}\rangle \\ |\frac{-1}{2}\frac{1}{2}\rangle \\ |\frac{-1}{2}\frac{-1}{2}\rangle \end{array} \right) = \left(\begin{array}{c} \cos\theta'|\frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{2}\rangle + \sin\theta' e^{-i\varphi}|\frac{-1}{2}\frac{-1}{2}\rangle \\ \cos\theta'|\frac{1}{2}\frac{-1}{2}\rangle \pm \sin\theta'|\frac{-1}{2}\frac{1}{2}\rangle \\ \cos\theta'|\frac{1}{2}\frac{-1}{2}\rangle \mp \sin\theta'|\frac{1}{2}\frac{-1}{2}\rangle \\ \cos\theta'|\frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{2}\rangle - \sin\theta' e^{i\varphi}|\frac{-1}{2}\frac{-1}{2}\rangle \end{array} \right) \tag{4.53}$$

which also describes unitary rotations of Bell states with oscillating entanglement degrees in the Bloch sphere [9] due to explicit geometric interpretations of θ, φ in the Bloch sphere.

In **Class (2)**, Yang–Baxterization of the Bell matrix B_{2^n} has the form in terms of the Hamiltonian H_{2^n},

$$B_{2^n}(\theta') = e^{-i\theta' H_{2^n}}, \qquad H_{2^n} = \sigma_y \otimes \sigma_x^{\otimes n-1} \tag{4.54}$$

which derives the unitary evolution of GHZ state $|\Psi_l\rangle$ defined by (4.7),

$$B_{2^n}(\theta')|\Phi_l\rangle = \cos\theta'|\Phi_l\rangle - \sin\theta'\epsilon'(m_1)|\Phi_{\bar{l}}\rangle. \tag{4.55}$$

For example, the unitary evolution of GHZ states of three qubits determined by $B_{8,2}(\theta') = e^{-i\theta' H_{8,2}}$ have the following realization,

$$B_{8,2}(\theta')|\frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{2}\rangle = \cos\theta'|\frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{2}\rangle + \sin\theta'|\frac{-1}{2}\frac{-1}{2}\frac{-1}{2}\rangle, \quad H_{8,2} = \sigma_y \otimes \sigma_x^{\otimes 2}. \tag{4.56}$$

5 Conclusions

We have shown that one may associate to certain almost-complex structures anti-Hermitian representations of extraspecial 2-groups, which in turn give rise to unitary representations of the braid group factoring over extensions of 2-groups by symmetric groups. These unitary braid representations can be used to generate the maximally entangled GHZ states as well as faithful representations of the extraspecial 2-groups, which are ubiquitous in quantum error correction [22]. This provides a bridge, via the Jones representations at a 4-th root of unity, from GHZ states and almost-complex structures to the topological model for quantum computing [32, 33]. While the finiteness of the braid group image precludes these representations from forming a universal gate set (in the sense of [29]), this new connection suggests that quantum systems with braiding statistics modeled by the Jones representation at 4-th roots of unity may be used for quantum error correction.

Acknowledgments

Y. Zhang thanks L.H. Kauffman for stimulating discussions, and he is supported in part by the Seed Grant of University of Utah and NSFC–10605035. Y.-S. Wu is supported in part by U.S. NSF through Grant No. PHY-0407187.

A Derivation of equations (3.16)

We present calculational details on the derivation of the three constraint equations (3.16) with the help of definitions of the almost-complex structure M^{JJ} (3.13) and the extraspecial 2-group $\mathbf{E}_m$ (3.1).

The M^{JJ} has the form depending on deformation parameters q_{ij},

$$M^{JJ} = \sum_{i,j=-J}^{J} \epsilon(i) q_{ij} |ij\rangle\langle -i-j|, \qquad i,j = J, J-1, \cdots - J, \tag{A.1}$$

where the generalized step function $\epsilon(i)$ is defined by (2.1).

The first constraint equation $q_{ij}q_{-i-j} = 1$ is obtained by

$$\begin{aligned} (M^{JJ})^2 &= \sum_{i,j,i',j'} \epsilon(i)\epsilon(i') q_{ij} q_{i'j'} |ij\rangle\langle -i'-j'| \delta^{i'}_{-i} \delta^{j'}_{-j} \\ &= -\sum_{ij} q_{ij} q_{-i-j} |ij\rangle\langle ij| = -\mathbb{1}^2_{2J+1} \end{aligned} \tag{A.2}$$

where $\epsilon(i)\epsilon(-i) = -1$ has been exploited.

The second one $q_{ij}q_{-ij}{=}q_{jl}q_{j-l}$ is determined by the anti-commutation relation between $\phi^{(1)}_m(e_1)$ and $\phi^{(1)}_m(e_2)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \phi^{(1)}_m(e_1)\phi^{(1)}_m(e_2) &= \sum_{i,j,l,i',j',l'} \epsilon(i) q_{ij} |ijl\rangle\langle -i-jl| \epsilon(j') q_{j'l'} |i'j'l'\rangle\langle i'-j'-l'| \\ &= -\sum_{i,j,l} \epsilon(i)\epsilon(j) q_{ij} q_{-jl} |ijl\rangle\langle -ij-l|, \\ \phi^{(1)}_m(e_2)\phi^{(1)}_m(e_1) &= \sum_{i,j,l,i',j',l'} \epsilon(j) q_{jl} |ijl\rangle\langle i-j-l| \epsilon(i') q_{i'j'} |i'j'l'\rangle\langle -i'-j'l'| \\ &= \sum_{i,j,l} \epsilon(j)\epsilon(i) q_{jl} q_{i-j} |ijl\rangle\langle -ij-l|, \end{aligned} \tag{A.3}$$

together with $\epsilon(-j) = -\epsilon(j)$ and the first constraint.

The third $q^*_{ij}q_{ij} = 1$ follows from the anti-Hermitian form of M^{JJ}, i.e.,

$$(M^{JJ})^\dagger = \sum_{i,j} \epsilon(i) q^*_{ij} |-i-j\rangle\langle ij| = -\sum_{i,j} \epsilon(i) q^*_{-i-j} |ij\rangle\langle -i-j| = -M^{JJ} \tag{A.4}$$

along with the first constraint condition.

As a byproduct, the above calculation explains how we introduce the generalized step function since only its following properties have been involved,

$$\epsilon(i)\epsilon(-i) = -1, \quad \epsilon(-i) = -\epsilon(i) \tag{A.5}$$

which are used to define the generalized step function (2.1) with solutions $\epsilon(i) = \pm 1$ and $\epsilon(-i) = \mp 1$.

B Comment on deformation parameters in Class (1)

We prove that as representation of the extraspecial 2-groups $\mathbf{E}_m$, $M_{2k} \otimes P_{2k}$ (see equation (3.18)) with unimodular deformation parameters q_{ij} is unitarily equivalent to $M'_{2k} \otimes P'_{2k}$ without deformation (i.e., $q_{ij} = 1$) :

$$M'_{2k} = \sum_{i=-J}^{J} \epsilon(i)|i\rangle\langle -i|, \quad P'_{2k} = \sum_{i=-J}^{J} |i\rangle\langle -i|. \tag{B.1}$$

With the help of the unitary matrix U_{2k} and its Hermitian conjugation $U^\dagger_{2k}$,

$$U_{2k} = \sum_{i=-J}^{J} q_i^{\frac{1}{2}}|i\rangle\langle i|, \quad U^\dagger_{2k} = \sum_{i=-J}^{J} q_{-i}^{\frac{1}{2}}|i\rangle\langle i| \tag{B.2}$$

M_{2k}, P_{2k} can be respectively shown to be unitarily similar to M'_{2k}, P'_{2k},

$$M_{2k} = U_{2k} M'_{2k} U^\dagger_{2k} = \sum_{i=-J}^{J} \epsilon(i) q_i |i\rangle\langle -i|,$$
$$P_{2k} = U_{2k} P'_{2k} U^\dagger_{2k} = \sum_{i=-J}^{J} q_i |i\rangle\langle -i| \tag{B.3}$$

which leads to the statement that $M_{2k} \otimes P_{2k}$ is equivalent to the representation $M'_{2k} \otimes P'_{2k}$, i.e.,

$$M_{2k} \otimes P_{2k} = (U_{2k} \otimes U_{2k})(M'_{2k} \otimes P'_{2k})(U^\dagger_{2k} \otimes U^\dagger_{2k}) \tag{B.4}$$

via the unitary basis transformation $|i'j'\rangle = (U_{2k} \otimes U_{2k})|ij\rangle$. In other words, the new orthonormal basis $|i'\rangle$ (3.23) is defined by

$$|i'\rangle := U_{2k}|i\rangle = q_i^{\frac{1}{2}}|i\rangle, \quad \langle j'| = \langle j|U^\dagger_{2k} = \langle j|q_{-j}^{\frac{1}{2}}, \tag{B.5}$$

which satisfies the orthonormal relations,

$$\langle i'|j'\rangle = \delta_{ij}, \quad |i'\rangle\langle i'| = q_i|i\rangle\langle i|. \tag{B.6}$$

Note that the unitary equivalence (B.4) as group representations does not suggest deformation parameters have no physical meaning; for example, in adiabatic quantum evolution they may lead to non-trivial Berry phases.

C The generalized quantum Yang–Baxter equation

The $\check{R}_i(x)$-matrix in terms of the representation $\phi_{n-1}(e_i)$ of the extraspecial 2-group $\mathbf{E}_n$ of the form

$$\check{R}_i(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}((1+x)\mathbb{1} + (1-x)\phi_{n-1}(e_i)) \tag{C.1}$$

can be shown to satisfy the QYBE (4.38). The proof is by calculation:

$$\begin{aligned}&\sqrt{2}\check{R}_i(x)\check{R}_{i+1}(xy)\check{R}_i(y) = ((1+xy)(x+y)\mathbb{1}\\&+(1-xy)(y-x)\phi_{n-1}(e_i)\phi_{n-1}(e_{i+1})\\&+(1+xy)(1-xy)(\phi_{n-1}(e_i)+\phi_{n-1}(e_{i+1})))\end{aligned} \tag{C.2}$$

which is symmetric under $i \leftrightarrow i+1$ and $x \leftrightarrow y$ so that $\check{R}_i(x)$ satisfies (4.38).

In the **Class (1)** representation for $\mathbf{E}_n$, equation (4.38) is the standard version of the QYBE exploited in the literature, i.e.,

$$(\check{R}(x)\otimes\mathbb{1}_{2k})(\mathbb{1}_{2k}\otimes\check{R}(xy))(\check{R}(y)\otimes\mathbb{1}_{2k}) = (\mathbb{1}_{2k}\otimes\check{R}(y))(\check{R}(xy)\otimes\mathbb{1}_{2k})(\mathbb{1}_{2k}\otimes\check{R}(x))$$

where $\check{R}_i(x)$ is an invertible $2k\otimes 2k$ matrix. However in the **Class (2)** representation for $\mathbf{E}_n$, equation (4.38) is an example of a *generalized version* of the QYBE given by

$$(\check{R}(x)\otimes\mathbb{1}_l)(\mathbb{1}_l\otimes\check{R}(xy))(\check{R}(y)\otimes\mathbb{1}_l) = (\mathbb{1}_l\otimes\check{R}(y))(\check{R}(xy)\otimes\mathbb{1}_l)(\mathbb{1}_l\otimes\check{R}(x))$$

where $l = p^k$ $(2 \le p \in \mathbb{N})$ and $\check{R}(x)$ is an invertible $p^N \otimes p^N$ matrix, in other words, (4.38) is a Yang–Baxterized version of the generalized YBE (2.10).

By reparameterization, the above $\check{R}(x)$-matrix has a new formulation, $\check{R}_i(\Theta)$ given by

$$\check{R}_i(\Theta) = \mathbb{1} + \tanh\Theta\ \phi_{n-1}(e_i) \tag{C.3}$$

satisfying another formulation of the QYBE (4.38),

$$\check{R}_i(\Theta_1)\check{R}_{i+1}(\Theta_1+\Theta_2)\check{R}_i(\Theta_2) = \check{R}_{i+1}(\Theta_2)\check{R}_i(\Theta_1+\Theta_2)\check{R}_{i+1}(\Theta_1), \tag{C.4}$$

which may be related to elastic or inelastic scattering phenomena in quantum physics. Interested readers are invited to refer to [7, 8] and our further research.

References

[1] H.A. Dye, *Unitary Solutions to the Yang–Baxter Equation in Dimension Four*, Quant. Inf. Proc. **2** (2003) 117-150. Arxiv: quant-ph/0211050.

[2] L.H. Kauffman and S.J. Lomonaco Jr., *Braiding Operators are Universal Quantum Gates*, New J. Phys. **6** (2004) 134. Arxiv: quant-ph/0401090.

[3] Y. Zhang, L.H. Kauffman and M.L. Ge, *Universal Quantum Gate, Yang–Baxterization and Hamiltonian.* Int. J. Quant. Inform. **3** no. 4 (2005) 669-678. Arxiv: quant-ph/0412095.

[4] Y. Zhang, L.H. Kauffman and M.L. Ge, *Yang–Baxterizations, Universal Quantum Gates and Hamiltonians.* Quant. Inf. Proc. **4** (2005) 159-197. Arxiv: quant-ph/0502015.

[5] J. Franko, E.C. Rowell and Z. Wang, *Extraspecial 2-Groups and Images of Braid Group Representations.* J. Knot Theory Ramifications, **15** (2006) 413-428. Arxiv: math.RT/0503435.

[6] Y. Zhang, L.H. Kauffman and R.F. Werner, *Permutation and its Partial Transpose.* Int. J. Quant. Inform. **5** no. 3 (2006) 1-39. Arxiv: quant-ph/0606005.

[7] Y. Zhang, N. Jing and M.L. Ge, *Quantum Algebras Associated With Bell States.* Arxiv: math-ph/0610036.

[8] Y. Zhang and M.L. Ge, *GHZ States, Almost-Complex Structure and Yang–Baxter Equation.* Accepted by Quant. Inf. Proc. for publication. Arxiv: quant-ph/0701224.

[9] M. Nielsen and I. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, 1999).

[10] C.N. Yang, *Some Exact Results for the Many Body Problems in One Dimension with Repulsive Delta Function Interaction*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **19** (1967) 1312-1314.

[11] R.J. Baxter, *Partition Function of the Eight-Vertex Lattice Model*, Annals Phys. **70** (1972) 193-228.

[12] J.L. Brylinski and R. Brylinski, *Universal Quantum Gates*, in *Mathematics of Quantum Computation*, Chapman & Hall/CRC Press, Boca Raton, Florida, 2002 (edited by R. Brylinski and G. Chen).

[13] V.F.R. Jones, *Baxterization*, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A6** (1991) 2035-2043.

[14] M.L. Ge, K. Xue and Y-S. Wu, *Explicit Trigonometric Yang–Baxterization*, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A6** (1991) 3735.

[15] R.F. Werner, *Quantum States with Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen Correlations Admitting a Hidden-Variable Model*, Phys. Rev. A **4**0 (1989) 4277.

[16] M. Horodecki and P. Horodecki, *Reduction Criterion of Separability and Limits for A Class of Distillation Protoco*, Phys. Rev. A **59** (1999) 4206.

[17] D.M. Greenberger, M.A.Horne and A.Zeilinger, *Going beyond Bell's Theorem*, in *Bell's Theorem, Quantum Theory, and Conceptions of the Universe*, edited by M. Kafatos, pp. 73–76, (Kluwer Academic, Dordrecht, 1989).

[18] D.M. Greenberger, M.A. Horne, A. Shirnony, and A.Zeilinger, *Bell's Theorem Without Inequalities*, Am. J. Phys. **58** (1990) 1131-1143.

[19] D. Bouwmeester, J.-W. Pan, M. Daniell, H. Weinfurter and A. Zeilinger, *Observation of Three-Photon Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger Entanglement*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**(1999) 1345-1349.

[20] V. F. R. Jones, *Braid groups, Hecke algebras and Type* II_1 *Factors,* Geometric methods in operator algebras (Kyoto, 1983), 242–273, Pitman Res. Notes Math. Ser., **123**, Longman Sci. Tech., Harlow, 1986.

[21] V. F. R. Jones, *Hecke Algebra Representations of Braid Groups and Link Polynomials,* Ann. Math. **126** (1987), 335–388.

[22] A. Calderbank, E. Rains, P. Shor and N. Sloane, *Quantum Error Correction and Orthogonal Geometry*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78** (1997) 405.

[23] A. Calderbank, E. Rains, P. Shor and N. Sloane, *Quantum Error Correction via Codes over GF(4)*, IEEE *Transactions on Information Theory*, **44(4)** (1998) 1369.

[24] D. Gottesman, *Stablizer Codes and Quantum Error Correction*, PhD Thesis, Caltech, 1997.

[25] B. Abdesselam, A. Chakrabarti, V.K. Dobrev and S.G. Mihov, *Higher Dimensional Unitary Braid Matrices: Construction, Associated Structures and Entanglements*, J. Math. Phys. **48** (2007) 053508. ArXiv:math/0702188.

[26] D.M. Goldschmidt and V.F.R. Jones, *Metaplectic Link Invariants*, Geom. Dedicata **31** (1989) 165-191.

[27] W. Fulton, J. Harris, *Representation theory, A First Course*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, **129**. Readings in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1991.

[28] R. Griess, *Automorphisms of Extra Special Groups and Nonvanishing Degree Two Cohomology*, Pacific J. Math. **48** no. 2 (1973) 403–422.

[29] M. Freedman, M. Larsen, Z. Wang, *The Two-Eigenvalue Problem and Density of Jones Representation of Braid Groups,* Comm. Math. Phys. **228** (2002) 177-199. ArXiv: math.GT/0103200.

[30] K. Fujii, H. Oike and T. Suzuki, *More on the Isomorphism* $SU(2)\otimes SU(2)\cong SO(4)$, Int. J. Geom. Methods Mod. Phys. **4** no. 3 (2007) 471–485.

[31] Y. Makhlin, *Nonlocal Properties of Two-Qubit Gates and Mixed States and Optimization of Quantum Computations*, Quant. Info. Proc. **1** (2002) 243.

[32] M. Freedman, A. Kitaev, M. Larsen and Z. Wang, *Topological Quantum Computation,* Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.) **40** no. 1 (2003) 31–38.

[33] L.H. Kauffman and S.J. Lomonaco Jr, *Q-Deformed Spin Networks, Knot Polynomials and Anyonic Topological Computation*, J. Knot Theory Ramifications, **16** (2007) 267-332. Arxiv: quant-ph/0606114.